

# EXHIBIT PP

1 CHAD W. DUNN  
2 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
3 SONNI WAKNIN  
4 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
5 UCLA Voting Rights Project  
6 3250 Public Affairs Building  
7 Los Angeles, CA 90095  
8 Telephone: (310) 400-6019

MOLLY P. MATTER, WSBA #52311  
Amend Law, LLC  
PO Box 13203  
Burton, WA 98013  
Telephone: (206) 280-8724

EDWARD MORFIN  
Morfin Law Firm  
732 N. Center Parkway  
Kennewick, WA 99336  
Telephone: 509-380-9999

9 ROSEMARY M. RIVAS  
10 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
11 MARK H. TROUTMAN  
12 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
13 GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
14 1111 Broadway, Suite 2100  
15 Oakland, CA 94607  
16 Telephone: (510) 350-9700  
17 Facsimile: (510) 350-9701

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
17 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

18 JESSE REYES, DANIEL REYNOSO, LEAGUE  
19 OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS,  
20 LATINO COMMUNITY FUND OF  
21 WASHINGTON

Plaintiffs,

22 vs.

23 BRENDA CHILTON, et al.,

24 Defendants.

Case No.: 4:21-cv-05075-MKD

**PLAINTIFF DANIEL REYNOSO'S  
AMENDED AND SUPPLEMENTAL  
RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO  
DEFENDANTS' FIRST  
INTERROGATORIES**

JUDGE: HON. MARY K. DIMKE

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Daniel Reynoso, by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby provide the following responses and objections to Defendants' First Interrogatories.

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1. Plaintiff's responses to Defendants' Interrogatories are made without prejudice to Plaintiff's rights to contend at any other stage of the proceedings that the requested responses are irrelevant, inadmissible, or otherwise objectionable.

2. Plaintiff reserves the right to revise, supplement, correct or clarify any of their responses as necessary or appropriate.

3. Plaintiff objects to each Interrogatory to the extent it seeks responses protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privileges or immunities. No waiver of any such privilege or immunity is intended by any responses by Plaintiffs. Such inadvertent disclosure is further protected and does not operate as a waiver pursuant to Rule 502(b) of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

**OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES**

**INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

For the past five years, please state (a) each election in which you voted; (b) how you submitted your ballot (e.g., in-person or by mail); (c) whether the signature on your ballot declaration was determined not to match the signature in your voter registration file; (d) whether you received notice of the signature mismatch; (e) whether you submitted by the deadline the form necessary to cure the signature mismatch; and (f) whether your vote was counted in the election in which you voted.

**RESPONSE:**

Plaintiff objects on the grounds that the interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad as to the terms "each election" because it is not limited to elections in Benton, Chelan, or Yakima counties. To the extent the interrogatory seeks information related to elections not administered by Defendants, Plaintiff objects to the interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information that is not

1 relevant to the parties' claims and defenses and proportional to the needs of the case. Plaintiff also  
2 objects to the interrogatory to the extent Defendants have exclusive or equal access to such  
3 information and/or to the extent the requested information is publicly available.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as to elections  
5 that took place in the State of Washington as follows: Plaintiff recalls the following:

- 6 a. Plaintiff voted in the 2017 General Election, 2018 Primary and General Election, 2020  
7 General Election, and 2022 Special Election. Plaintiff's ballots were submitted by  
8 mail. Plaintiff believes the signatures on his ballot declarations were determined to  
9 match the signature in his voter registration file. He received a notice only for the 2018  
10 General Election. Plaintiff does not know whether his votes were counted in these  
11 elections.
- 12 b. 2018 General Election: Plaintiff voted in the 2018 General Election. Plaintiff's ballot  
13 was submitted by mail. Plaintiff's signature on his ballot declaration was determined not  
14 to match the signature in his voter registration file. Plaintiff received notice of the  
15 signature mismatch after the election. Plaintiff did not submit by the deadline the form  
16 necessary to cure the signature mismatch. Plaintiff's vote was not counted in the 2018  
17 general election.

18 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:**

- 19 c. Plaintiff voted in the Special Election in February 2022 (2/8/2022).  
20 d. Plaintiff voted in the General Election (11/8/2016)  
21 e. Plaintiff voted in the General Elections (11/6/2012)

22  
23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

24 For each election, from all time periods, for which (1) you were notified that the signature on  
25 your ballot declaration was determined not to match the signature in Your voter registration file, and  
26 (2) you failed to submit by the deadline the form necessary to Cure the signature mismatch, please  
27  
28

1 awarded to a plaintiff where the evidence shows a breach of duty owed to him or an invasion of his  
 2 legal rights, without showing that he has thereby sustained a material injury.”); *See Steele v.*  
 3 *Organon, Inc.*, 43 Wash. App. 230, 235 (1986) (nominal damages are defined as “damages awarded  
 4 for the infraction of a legal right, where the extent of the loss is not shown, or where the right is one  
 5 not dependent upon loss or damage.”) (internal quotations omitted). Plaintiff further expects that  
 6 materials in forthcoming expert reports will be responsive.

7 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:**

8 Plaintiff seeks nominal damages and any expenses incurred attempting to cure ballot or  
 9 ensure that ballot was counted.

10  
 11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

12 Please describe fully the terms of the injunction You seek against each of Benton County,  
 13 Chelan County, and Yakima County.

14 **RESPONSE:**

15 Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, burdensome and  
 16 premature at this stage in the litigation. *See In re eBay Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C 07-1882, 2008  
 17 WL 5212170, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008); *In re Convergent Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328,  
 18 332-38 (N.D. Cal. 1985); *See also Olson v. City of Bainbridge Island*, No. C08-5513RJB, 2009 WL  
 19 1770132, at \*4 (W.D. Wash. June 18, 2009) (upholding “overly broad” objection to contention  
 20 interrogatory which requested “all facts and all evidence” supporting a particular allegation); *See*  
 21 *also Advocare Int'l, L.P. v. Scheckenbach*, No. C08-5332 RBL, 2009 WL 3064867, at \*1 (W.D.  
 22 Wash. Sept. 24, 2009) (“Numerous federal courts have held that contention interrogatories which  
 23 systematically track all of the allegations in an opposing party's pleadings, and that ask for each and  
 24 every fact and application of law to fact that supports the party's allegations are an abuse of the  
 25 discovery process because they are overly broad and unduly burdensome.”) (internal quotations  
 26 omitted). Plaintiff also objects to the interrogatory on the grounds that it calls for expert testimony  
 27 prior to the deadline of the exchange of expert reports in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows:  
 2 Plaintiff expects that materials in forthcoming expert reports will be responsive. Plaintiff intends to  
 3 provide a response to this interrogatory by January 20, 2023 assuming discovery deadlines do not  
 4 change. Should additional information surface in light of continuing discovery obligations, Plaintiff  
 5 reserves the right to supplement or respond thereafter.

6 **SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE:**

7 Plaintiff is seeking a permanent injunction against Benton, Chelan, and Yakima Counties that  
 8 would declare the application of the signature verification process RCW 29A.40.110 violative of the  
 9 United States Constitution and of Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act, 52 U.S.C. § 10301.  
 10 Plaintiff seeks to enjoin Defendants, their agents and successors, and all persons acting in concert  
 11 with, or as agents of, any Defendants from implementing RCW 29A.40.110 and WAC 434-261-050  
 12 in future elections.

13  
 14 Dated: May 1, 2023

/s/Mark H. Troutman

16 ROSEMARY M. RIVAS  
 17 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 18 MARK H. TROUTMAN  
 19 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*  
 20 GIBBS LAW GROUP LLP  
 21 1111, Suite 2100  
 22 Oakland, CA 94607  
 23 Telephone: (510) 350-9700  
 24 Facsimile: (510) 350-9701

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**VERIFICATION OF INTERROGATORY ANSWERS**

I, Daniel Reynoso, verify that I have read and know the contents of the foregoing  
**Plaintiff Daniel Reynoso's Amended and Supplemental Responses and Objections to  
Defendant's First Interrogatories** and believe them to be true and correct.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is  
true and correct.

Executed on this 3 day of May 2023, at Yakima, WA.  
(City, State)


*DRE*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Daniel Reynoso



# Signature Certificate

Reference number: JATA7-99YKK-RTXVN-HUZZ

Signer	Timestamp	Signature
<b>Daniel Reynoso</b> Email: dreynoso826@gmail.com Shared via link  Sent: Viewed: Signed:	   03 May 2023 21:58:19 UTC 03 May 2023 21:58:33 UTC 03 May 2023 22:56:12 UTC	  IP address: 172.223.249.11 Location: Yakima, United States

Document completed by all parties on:  
03 May 2023 22:56:12 UTC

Page 1 of 1



**Signed with PandaDoc**

PandaDoc is a document workflow and certified eSignature solution trusted by 40,000+ companies worldwide.

